

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).

Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50.

Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.

Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

Vol. XXII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1929

WHOLE No. 601

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN

By B. L. ULLMAN

Professor of Latin, University of Chicago

and NORMAN E. HENRY

Peabody High School, Pittsburgh

This is a revision of the authors' successful ELEMENTARY LATIN. This new book, however, does not replace the earlier. The two are intended for different uses. This book is intended for use where a two-semester book is wanted and where it is thought desirable to postpone the study of the subjunctive mood until the second year. The older book might be called the "subjunctive edition" since it includes the study of the subjunctive mood in the first year of the study.

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN is characterized by the same fundamental principles as the older book. It contains the same stress on the correlation of Latin and English, the same large amount of connected reading, the same attractive mechanical appearance.

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN differs from the older book in these respects:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Meets the recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation and the Tentative Syllabus in Ancient Languages (1928). | book to their respective places in the lessons. |
| 2. Omission of the subjunctive. | 4. Introduction of the present imperative and the vocative. |
| 3. Transfer of the connected Latin passages from the end of the | 5. Addition of a series of sections in English on Roman life, of a greater variety of drill exercises, of new illustrations, and of vocabulary reviews. |
| | 6. The use of larger type. |

ELEMENTARY LATIN, \$1.40

SECOND LATIN BOOK, \$1.68

NEW ELEMENTARY LATIN, In Press

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

In order to enable schools to comply with the recommendations in the Report of the Classical Investigation and to meet the new examination requirements, the American Book Company has just published a new textbook for first-year work, LATIN I, by PEARSON, LAWRENCE, and RAYNOR, which is to be accompanied by a Teacher's Manual and Key.

Cloth 544 pages. Illustrations and Vocabularies. \$1.40

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1929

WHOLE No. 601

MISAPPLICATION OF SCIENCE WRONG TEACHING OF SCIENCE

For a little over two years New York University has issued a paper, called *New York*, under the editorship of Mr. Harold De Wolf Fuller. As part of the heading one finds the words "A Four-Page Journal of Ideas for the General Reader". In the issue for Saturday, December 15, 1928 (Volume 2, No. 50) there was an article entitled *In the Sacred Name of Science*. Since the article is unsigned, I infer that it was written by the editor. I give the major part of it here, since it expresses thoughts which lovers of the Classics entertain with respect to certain eternal verities which engage their minds and hearts.

"In spite of all the new discoveries, there is a truth in the past which is not and cannot be ignored nor brushed aside. Much of the knowledge of the past is still eternal truth, and just as Einstein embraces all Newton, so presumably the truth of the present is merely a supplement to and an extension of the truth of the past." So declares Dr. R. A. Millikan in last Sunday's *New York Times*. Said Chancellor Brown a year or two ago, "Students must gain the power to render change itself a factor in moral stability." The scientist and the university president aim at the same thing. This is the great need of the present, to discover anchors that do not drag. Somewhere in all the questions which have been uppermost in the past decade or so are fixed truths to which people can repair in times of doubt and unsettlement. Where are they?

Dr. Millikan does a real service in stressing this fact. One of the most distinguished of American scientists, he has no fear that science, which more than anything else is responsible for the rapid changes in our era, will leave us without moral and spiritual props. Like Voltaire, he believes that if God did not exist it would be necessary to invent Him. Upon scientists with his oriented faith our age is particularly dependent for guidance.

Indeed, it would be well if leaders of science would make a concerted effort to instruct the public in the limitations of science quite as much as in its vast possibilities¹. For as regards science the public has been decidedly "oversold." The greatest reproach that can be brought against a person today is to say that he is "unscientific." It is small wonder that this should be so, considering the strides which science has recently made in mastering natural forces and applying them to the needs of mankind. Miracles some of these would have seemed not more than a quarter of a century ago. *All the same, science is not yet everything and there are plenty of truths dating from far back which have not yet been overthrown. Greek symmetry, whether in architecture or in life, still holds its own. Leonardo da Vinci is remembered for his paintings rather than for his speculations on aviation. Shakespeare, who had but a smattering of science, has never been surpassed, or equaled, as a dramatist¹.*

But today belief in the power of science is our ruling fetish. It has taken hold in educational circles almost as much as in less strictly trained minds. Production, distribution, social reform, education, the writing

of history all show its effects, and it is headed up in the popular feeling towards prosperity. In some way or other science, supposedly, can furnish a technology for each of our varied activities. . . .

The spell of science has not been easy to resist. If science was so potent in its own bailiwick why could not its method be transferred to other spheres? This was the question first asked by scholars. History soon felt the urge. Since the scientific method meant ascertaining facts, as distinguished from guessing them, and proceeding from one ascertained fact to another and accepting no inference not based upon such ascertained facts, the method seemed reasonable for the study and writing of history, too. It did, indeed, help students of history much. Origins and causes of wars were examined anew, with some surprising results, especially as regards American history. Yet we have this statement from the authority, George Trevelyan Macaulay, regius professor of modern history at the University of Cambridge, made late in 1927: "Sir Walter Scott, who was a great antiquarian before ever he commenced to be a novelist, did more for history, I venture to think, than any professed historian in modern times. . . . It was he who first taught us to think of our ancestors as real human beings with passions and absurdities like our own."

Then economics undertook to become scientific, and made such progress that today in many minds any interpretation of life that is not predominantly economic is worthless. . . .

Psychology followed suit. Its application to everyday life is so well recognized that a magazine bearing the unadorned name *Psychology* is read eagerly by the man in the street. A successful teacher goes so far as to say that 85 per cent of one's earning power, to the extent at least that this is determined by education, is produced by expertness in business psychology.

Finally, the science of statistics which has advanced so notably in the past few years, has combined with all the other rehabilitated subjects, until their united efforts are formidable indeed. Schools of education, philanthropy, social betterment, civic reform all swear allegiance to the scientific method. . . .

Science has done wonders for our civilization, but the misunderstanding of science can destroy us just as wonderfully. This can rob us of religion, can reduce art to technique, make a yardstick of education, exalt material prosperity to a national ideal. The way out of such difficulties is through the teachings of science itself. And Dr. Millikan and others are in a position to make these deeply felt, owing to the prestige which science now enjoys. First and foremost, is the passion for truth for its own sake and regardless of its money value which has kept scientists patiently at their confining tasks. Wealth is but a by-product of truth, and great magnates who today control vast fortunes are the beneficiaries of scientific research, most of which were pursued because some one loved truth more than he loved riches. This is a primary fact the stressing of which may be a wholesome corrective in a time of national prosperity.

Secondly, would that our men of science might shout from the housetops the fact that as a rule great scientists have possessed imagination and broad sympathies. . . . it requires imagination and understanding to grasp the meaning of the scientific method, its true scope and its limitations. Old truths still prevail, as Dr. Millikan justly points out. . . . old truths are the only safeguard. Our own nation may well take this to

¹The italics are mine.

heart. . . . Our great prosperity, largely the outcome of scientific advance coupled with vast natural resources, is the world's bugaboo just now. It needs the leaven of some good old human truths to make it a blessing.

In his Annual Report for the year ending June 30, 1927, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, had some very interesting things to say about the teaching of science in the United States. They were of general interest to me as student and teacher of the Classics, because they correspond so closely to the sort of things that so many, including President Butler himself, were saying at one period, over and over, about the teaching of the Classics in this country (note the last paragraph of the quotation given below). They were of special interest to me because the College in which I teach, though it has no vestige of a requirement in Classics, even for admission to the College, still prescribes a laboratory science for all candidates for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts. The passage I have in mind runs as follows (24-27):

In previous Annual Reports attention has been directed to the fact that scientific study as an educational instrument has fallen far short of the high expectations that were formed of it and for it when the scientific movement in education began some sixty years ago. Meanwhile the content of the natural and physical sciences has been multiplied manifold. Truly revolutionary discoveries and inventions have followed each other with amazing rapidity, and both the form and the material of daily life have been made over as a result of new scientific knowledge and its applications.

The scientific method is everywhere extolled and within certain limits is rigorously applied. Yet the public mind, reinforced each year by a veritable army of youth which is marched through scientific laboratories and lecture rooms, museums and observatories, is as untouched by scientific method as if no such thing existed. Even men of science themselves, when out of sight of their own laboratories, betray the most astounding willingness to become the victims of rumors, dogmatic assertions and emotional appeals of every sort. The fact of the matter would seem to be that scientific training and scientific method, despite all the time and labor and money that have been lavished upon them, have thus far failed to take hold of the minds and temperaments of vast numbers of those who have been offered scientific training in greater or lesser part.

Reflection on these exceptionally interesting facts prompts various queries and suggestions. Part of the difficulty may be found in the fact that science has been suffering from what may be described as a superiority complex which has prevented it from realizing its true place in the scheme of things. There is certainly no region or realm into which science does not or ought not to aim to penetrate, *on the plane in which science moves*. But that plane is, as every scholar in the field of human thinking must realize, a subordinate one. It is the plane upon which the world appears as made up not of definite and independent objects, but of infinite series of changing units whose inter-relations and inter-dependences are all-important and all-controlling. To science no object is independent. Each depends on every other and dependence,—relativity,—is the controlling principle of the universe. There remains, however, that still higher plane upon which the universe appears as a self-dependent, self-related, self-

active totality. It is on this plane that philosophy lives and moves and has its being, and on this plane that art and music and literature find the inspiration and the motive of those insights, aspirations and intuitions which pave the path to beauty.

This is neither the time nor the place unduly to argue these fundamental principles, but it is the time and the place to point out that if science as an educational instrument has not done what might reasonably be expected, it is first of all because it has not recognized the limitations that rest upon its place and function in the scheme of things. In the second place, science has been in large part badly taught and in large part is badly taught today. The sole reliance upon the laboratory method for introducing students to an understanding of scientific method, scientific fact and scientific accomplishment is well nigh disastrous. For the narrow specialist it does its work well, but for him who wishes to know something of modern science as an instrument of culture and as a branch of organized knowledge, it is not the correct point of departure. The laboratory method is the true method of discovery but it is not the true method of elementary exposition and instruction. First of all the student approaching for the first time any part of the field of scientific knowledge should have that field described and explained to him, its relation to other fields of scientific knowledge pointed out and the main lines of its historic development described and illustrated. The student of physics, for example, should be shown how physics has come to be; where and how it originated; what are its relations to mathematics, to astronomy, to chemistry; when and how did it pass from what may be called its astrological to its astronomical phase; who were the personalities who first unfolded and defined fundamental physical facts and laws; what did they look like, when did they live, what was their relation to their contemporaries. In other words, the student approaching the subject of physics should be made to feel that physics instead of being a very small part of a cross-section of the world of today is really a splendid intellectual discipline with a long and notable history, and that it has come to be what it is by steps and stages that can be easily marked out and mastered. The moment the student gets this view of physics, his study of it takes hold of him with redoubled power because he sees himself dealing with a vast and continuing human interest. Then is the time for the laboratory method to be drawn upon to show him the technique of present-day knowledge and present-day discovery. In short, the natural and physical sciences have an enormous value as cultural subjects which has been in large part lost by bad methods of teaching and presentation. The specialist gets from his study of science all that he needs for his specialty, but science meanwhile stands apart from the general stream of cultural influence and development. Faraday and Maxwell, Huxley and Tyndall, Berthelot and Pasteur, Helmholtz and Kelvin, as well as our own Pupin and Millikan, are scientific teachers of a different type. They all have in high degree the power of so interpreting science that at their hands it becomes a genuine instrument for the improvement of popular thinking and public action and a vitally important element of broad and fine culture.

As was indicated in an earlier Annual Report, no small part of the influence which caused the decline and fall of the ancient classics as a chief instrument of education was contributed by the unhappy methods of instruction pursued by the classical teachers themselves. If now science is to be sentenced to a similar fate, there will be nothing left of the tested educational instruments, and the next generation will be sentenced to the very poor and pretentious substitute of vocational instruction.

CHARLES KNAPP

ON DIRECT AND INDIRECT DISCOURSE

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.24, in his review of Professor Otto Jespersen's book, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, Professor E. H. Sturtevant referred to a discussion in Chapter XXI of a compromise between direct and indirect discourse, which is fairly common in modern literature....

Professor Sturtevant explained as follows what he had in mind:

...it differs from ordinary indirect discourse chiefly in retaining interjections and direct questions and commands, while it differs from direct discourse in the management of persons and tenses....

He went on to say that "Latin occasionally has something similar..."; as an example he cited Horace, *Carmina* 3. 2. 9-12:

suspiret, eheu, ne rudis agminum
sponsus lacessat regius asperum
tactu leonem, quem cruenta
per medias rapit ira caedes.

On these verses he wrote as follows:

...The use of *ehou* and the indicative *rapit* mark this off from indirect discourse, while the use of the third person *lacessat* prevents our calling the passage a direct quotation.

I cannot refrain from questioning this statement.

In the first place, since the maiden is evidently watching, but not addressing, her *sponsus regius*, there seems no reason for believing that "the use of the third person *lacessat* prevents our calling the passage a direct quotation". The words *ne...lacessat* might easily be regarded as containing an independent optative directly quoted, though to me, as to various editors of Horace, it seems preferable to view them as the object of an implied verb of fearing¹.

In the second place, I cannot agree that "the indicative *rapit* mark <s> this off from indirect discourse..." Whether or not the clause *ne...lacessat* is in indirect discourse, as it is, to all intents and purposes, if it is the really object of an implied verb of fearing, the clause *quem...caedes* does not belong in the indirect discourse. The watcher on the wall, in her agony and suspense, is not going to think, or say, or fear, anything about the self-evident fact, *leonem...cruenta per medias rapit ira caedes*. The clause *quem...caedes* is said by the writer, not by the girl. The subjunctive, *rapiat*, would be possible, as an integral part, not of the indirect discourse, but of Horace's prayer; the idea of *rapiat* is no more realized than is that of *suspiret*.

I add a point touched upon neither by Professor Jespersen nor by Professor Sturtevant, the fact that the precise use of quotation-marks would militate against

the fusion of direct and indirect discourse. The tendency to omit quotation-marks is general among certain modern writers, writers of the school that loves to reproduce the vague and haphazard meanderings of the so-called 'stream of consciousness'. For instance, George Moore, in *Esther Waters*, uses quotation-marks for direct quotations of speeches, but not for direct quotations of thoughts; in *The Brook Kerith* and in *Héloise and Abélard* he does away with quotation-marks altogether, with results that to me are decidedly disconcerting. I quote two passages from the opening chapter (pages 1, 3) of *The Brook Kerith* (New York, Macmillan, 1916):

...Joseph, sitting on his grandmother's knee, heard her tell that Kish having lost his asses sent Saul, his son, to seek them in the land of the Benjamites and the land of Shalisha, whither they might have strayed. But they were not in these lands, Son, she continued, nor in Zulp, whither Saul went afterwards, and being then tired out with looking for them he said to the servant: we shall do well to forget the asses....

...But she found an excuse for his rudeness, saying that his head was full of sleep—a remark that annoyed him considerably and sent him upstairs wishing that women would not talk about things they do not understand. I'll ask father in the morning why Granny laughed at me for saying I'd like to be a prophet. But as morning seemed still a long way ahead he tried to find a reason, but could find no better one than that prophets were usually old men. But I shall be old in time to come and have a beard....

In *Héloise and Abélard*, 36 (New York, Boni and Liveright, 1925), we read:

...Fulbert began to talk of his brother....It seemed as if he almost enjoyed talking of Philippe, or was it, she asked herself, that he could not do else but tell me of my father, or is it the wine that has loosened his tongue?....

These abrupt combinations of *Oratio Recta* and *Oratio Obliqua* would be far simpler and smoother if the two forms were distinguished by the normal use of quotation-marks; but a writer who employed quotation-marks in the normal way would probably not use such abrupt combinations.

On the other hand, a language that does not habitually use punctuation-marks with the precision of standard English is likely not to draw so sharp a line as we do between that which is within a quotation and that which is without it. For instance, we usually set apart very distinctly the title of a book or a play, e.g. by capitals, or quotation-marks, or italics. The French do not. The title of one of Molière's plays is thus often given by English writers as "*Les Précieuses Ridicules*" or *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. How could one punctuate in accordance with such usage a combination of words like 'une représentation des Précieuses ridicules', where the word *des* represents a union of *de* outside the title and *les* within the title?

A precisely analogous case occurs in Latin, e.g. in Ovid, *Met.* 10.568-570:

...instantem turbam violenta procorum
condicione fugat. "Nec sum potiunda, nisi" inquit
"victa prius cursu..."

¹To my mind it is immensely more effective, emotionally, to take the *ne*-clause as syntactically independent, as the girl's prayer, word for word, in direct discourse. The girl is apostrophizing, not addressing, her lover. Further, since *ehou* is emotionally and logically equivalent to *veritus*, it is needless to talk or think of "an implied verb of fearing" on which the *ne*-clause may depend.

In any event, since the syntax of the *ne*-clause is not determinable with certainty, the clause should never have been used to prove or to illustrate at point of syntactical or oratorical usage.

C. K. >

Here, from the English point of view, *Nec* is, logically, to be resolved into *et* outside the quotation and *Non* within it.

If quotation-marks had been in use among the Romans, Horace, *Sermones* 2.6.20 *Matutine pater, seu Iane² libentius audis*, and *Epistulae* 1.7.37-38 *rexque paterque audisti*, would probably represent the norm; *Matutine pater...Iane* and *Rexque paterque* would have been enclosed within quotation-marks. But then Vergil could not have done what he does in *Eclogues* 1.5, *formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas*: he really quotes a word (*Amaryllida*) which, logically, should have been (or might have been) in the vocative case, but, instead, is set in the accusative case as object of *resonare*. Had quotation-marks been in use, Vergil might have felt obliged to write *resonare doces "Amaryllis" silvas*, a form far less charming than the form he in fact uses³.

A more difficult passage is *Eclogues* 6.43-44:

His adiungit Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum
clamassent, ut litus Hyla, Hyla omne sonaret.

Possibly *Hylan* is used as *Amaryllida* is used, as a substitute for an original (or theoretically possible) vocative. Then the epithet *relictum* is comparable to the epithet *formosam*. *Hyla, Hyla* may be either a vocative⁴, used as is Horace's *Iane*, or an ablative⁵, used somewhat as is Vergil's *Amaryllida*⁷.

We find the illogical form again in *Georgics* 4.525-527:

...Eurydicen vox ipsa et frigida lingua
a miseram Eurydicen! anima fugiente vocabat:
Eurydicen toto referebant flumine ripae.

Here the irregularity is even more striking, because of the interjection *a* (compare *ehu* in Horace, *Carmina* 3.2.9). There is fusion of *miseram Eurydicen vocabat*

(a cry to the woman) and "*a misera Eurydice*" *vocabat* (an ejaculation of the name).

Comparable are two other examples, *Aeneid* 4.302-303 *audito stimulant...Baccho orgia* and *Aeneid* 7.582 *Martemque fatigant*. In each case, Conington maintains, the reference is probably to the cry, *Io Bacche* or *Mars, Mars*, not to the god⁸.

HUNTER COLLEGE

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

REVIEWS

A History of the Ancient World. Volume II: Rome. By M. Rostovtzeff. Translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press: New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch (1927). Pp. xiv + 387. 96 Plates. 2 Maps. \$5.00.

Professor Rostovtzeff's volume dealing with Rome completes his survey of the ancient world. In form and method it is identical with Volume I, which I reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 20.219-222. The defects in the work are in the main those which I have already pointed out. Again the most serious objection is the lack of adequate maps. There are but two. One (Italy) lacks clearness and seems overcrowded with details, although actually this is not the case; the other (The Roman Empire), while more helpful, is still inadequate¹. Considering the fact that the illustrations in this volume are so remarkably good, one regrets that equal care was not expended on the maps. In the presentation of such a theme, for instance, as the advance of Rome in the fourth and the third centuries (Chapter IV) they are almost essential.

It must be said that in certain other respects the volume is not quite satisfactory as a textbook. There are, for one thing, not enough dates in the narrative. The work is a popularized scholarly version of a course in ancient history, rather than a scholarly popular book. The author has less skill in narrative than in exposition, and seems unwilling to organize his material for the practical purposes of the class-room. In my review of the first volume (page 222, note 9) I quoted Professor Rostovtzeff's definite statement that his work "was not written merely as a text-book for the use of students..." Yet a work as authoritative and as attractively published as this will find its chief usefulness in the class-room, and it would have been a great help had more attention been paid to the clarity which is part of the textbook style. Students, I find, appreciate the reserve and the scholarly detachment with which Professor Rostovtzeff writes, but are quick to see and to criticize the rather awkward way in which

²The use of the vocative *Iane* was, perhaps, in part induced by the preceding vocative *Matutine*, i.e. the whole may = *Matutine pater*, vel, si <hoc> libentius audis, *Iane*. So, *Carmina* 1.2.30-33, *venias, precamur... augur Apollo, sive tu mavis, Erycina ridens, = venias, precamur, augur Apollo, vel, si mavis, venias tu, Erycina ridens*. Compare also *Carmen Saeculare* 14-16, quoted in note 7.

³Propertius uses the vocative instead of the accusative in 1.18.31, *resonant mihi Cythia silvae*, a verse which Conington cites as probably an imitation of this.

⁴In that case *clamassent* means simply 'shouted', not 'shouted for'. For the former use compare *Eclogues* 3.19 *cum clamarem*, "Quo nunc se proripit ille?" for the latter compare *Aeneid* 4.674 *morientem nomine clamat (= nomen morientis clamat)*.

⁵This is apparently the view of Hirtzel and of Page; they print *Hyla, Hyla* within quotation-marks.

⁶Although we can cite *Eclogues* 5.64 *ipsa sonant arbusta*, "Deus, deus ille, Menalca!" as an instance of a direct quotation with *sono*, and *Aeneid* 12.529-530 *sonantem nomina* as a similar transitive use of the verb, the ablative with *sono* is far the commonest construction in Vergil. I find in the *Eclogues*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid* seventeen possible or positive instances of the construction, and, though usually the ablative indicates the agent or the means producing the sound rather than the sound produced, we may offer as fair parallels to the verse under consideration at least *Georgics* 3.554-555 *balatu pecorum et crebris mugitibus amnes arentesque caeco intus saxa sonant...* With the compound *resonare* also, despite *Eclogues* 1.5, cited just above, the ablative is the commonest construction in Vergil, being found in eight out of the twelve undisputedly Vergilian passages in which the word *resono* occurs. The only other example of the accusative with *resono* is not the quite similar instance in *Georgics* 3.338 *lituraque alyconen resonant, acalanthida dumi*.

⁷A similar uncertainty exists with respect to *Carmen Saeculare* 14-16, *Ilithyia... sive tu Lucina probas vocari seu Genitalis; Lucina and Genitalis* may be either nominative or vocative. I consider them vocatives, and, therefore, like *Matutine* in Horace, *Sermones* 2.6.20. If they are nominatives, compare *ultor* in *Carmina* 1.5.43-44 *patriens vocari Caesaris ultor*.

⁸I accept without reservations Conington's view of *Aeneid* 4.302-303, but I have misgivings with respect to *Aeneid* 7.582. Conington calls *Martem* there a cognate accusative, although, as he admits, "To take 'Martem' as the god and 'fatigant' as i.q. 'precibus fatigant' would be simpler..." Horace's expression, *prece qua fatigant... Vestiam* (*Carmina* 1.2.26-28) points in this direction. But there is Vergilian evidence which Conington might have offered in his own defense, *Aeneid* 4.572-574... *sociosque fatigat: "Praecipites vigilate, viri, et considite transtris; solvite vela citi..."* The *socii* are importuned as *Latinus* is importuned in Book 7; the direct quotation, giving the words with which they are importuned, corresponds more or less closely to *Martem*.

⁹Many of the places mentioned in the text (some of them conspicuously, e.g. Rubicon, Pontus, Alesia, Dalmatia) are omitted.

the material is treated². Finally, there is an annoying inconsistency in the use of proper names. It will not bother scholars, to be sure, but it will certainly be confusing to students who read the book to find Latin names employed throughout on the maps, but Latin or English forms used indifferently in the text. Many students learn for themselves the connection between Tarraco and Tarragona, and dismiss the variations Messina and Messana as involving a typographical error, but few of them think of identifying the Jerusalem or Lyons of the text with the Hierosolyma or the Lugdunum of the maps.

In its essential features, however, this volume, like he first, is of unusual interest and value. The passages in which Professor Rostovtzeff illumines an historical event by a flash of insight, or summarizes some of the tendencies in Roman economic or social life are too numerous to discuss here; I shall, of necessity, confine myself to a few examples which invite special attention. The Punic Wars, for instance, are reduced in this narrative to rational length. Instead of the usual glowing retelling of Livy's tale, there is here (57-59, 63-69) a relatively brief account in which the romantic elements are eliminated, without loss of emphasis upon the really important feature—the unconquerable spirit of Rome. There is an equally admirable account of the civil warfare ending with the victory of Caesar (Chapter XI), sane, clear, and free from literary padding.

The chapter (70-82) on the entrance of Rome into Hellenistic politics is excellent. A familiar point is brought out, but is stressed in a new way, namely, that to Macedon and Syria the theory of the balance of power was irksome, and that in diplomatic intrigue every one of the minor Hellenistic powers made haste to upset it by dragging in the legions of Rome (70-71). At the same time, Rome is not represented as entirely unselfish. Flattered by the pleas of the cultured East³, she adopted at first a moderate attitude, but by 192 B. C. she had begun the overbearing policy for which she became so thoroughly hated by Greece and the East. The whole tangled situation is skillfully delineated by the author.

²The chapter on The Julian and Claudian Dynasties (XVI: 212-226) begins, for instance, with an account of the individual Emperors, then presents a second account of the same Emperors with stress on their environment. In the course of the first portion the author makes frequent mention of Agrippina the Younger; the second part begins (217) with a reference to Agrippina the Elder, called simply "Agrippina", which is most confusing to students who have no way of knowing that there were two women named Agrippina. The account would have been easier to follow had it received better synthesis and had the references to Agrippina presupposed less familiarity with the two women. Another example of difficulty caused by awkward presentation will be found in the account of the relation between the Gallic invasions and the military organization of early Rome (30-31).

³The passage here (72) may be found useful: "... Every Roman of that age felt the fascination of Greek genius and Greek culture, and realized the beauty and brilliance of the Hellenistic period. The legend which connected the origin of Rome with the Trojan war and thus with the earliest Greek history—a legend which passed for history with every Roman—took definite shape at this time for good reasons. Besides, Rome herself was a free city-state, and the Italian confederacy was an alliance of similar city-states. The word 'king' was a bogey to Roman ears: there was something American in their aversion to kings and kingly government. And now, victorious over a most dangerous enemy, conscious of her own strength and solidarity, and fully convinced that no shock could hurl her from her place, Rome was appealed to by city-states like herself—the states which had created the marvellous civilization of Greece—to aid them in the struggle against 'kings' and tyrants..."

The Gracchan agitation, another vexing problem of the Republic, is handled with the same poise. As Professor Rostovtzeff presents it, the land struggle initiated by the brothers was merely the logical outcome of the earlier attempts at reform by Cato, Scipio, and various radicals⁴. This leads to a rather novel explanation (116) of the foreign wars which came shortly after 133 B. C.: "...Hoping, probably, to divert popular attention from the critical issues raised by the Gracchi, the Senate, immediately after their victory at home, began a succession of foreign wars..."

Although written without bias⁵ the account never lacks the personal interpretation of the author: see, for example, the brief sketch of the Gallic Wars (137-138), and the comments on the extraordinary commands (128-130), and on the Catilinarian trouble (133-136). The interpretation of the Augustan period, in two chapters (175-197, 198-211), is a splendid synthesis, a general survey of the kind in which this author excels. Equally as well done is the survey of the Flavians and the Antonines (Chapter XVII, 227-241). The author places unique and convincing stress upon the Stoic conception of *noblesse oblige*, as basis to early imperial policy, and finds in it one of the motivating forces for the disturbances of the first century as well as for the harmony of the second. Chapters XVIII-XX give a thorough-going summary of the political, economic, and social conditions in the first two centuries of the Empire, a summary the fullness and the clarity of which are remarkable. There follows, in a skilful combination of detail and generalization, an excellent account (Chapter XXI) of the anarchy of the third century. Finally, Chapter XXIII presents an unusual survey of religion in the first three centuries—, unusual in the fact that it is based upon purely archaeological⁶ sources with practically no dependence upon literary or doctrinal evidence, unusual also for its attempt to describe religious conditions throughout the whole Empire.

Christianity, it may be noted, receives slight but significant treatment. I can indicate the character of this survey best by quoting Professor Rostovtzeff's version (350) of a very well-worn theme:

... One thing is clear: the victory of Christianity indicates a break with the past and a changed attitude in the history of the human mind. Men had grown weary and unwilling to seek further. They turned greedily to a creed that promised to calm the troubled mind, that could give certainty in place of doubt, a final solution for a host of problems, and theology instead of science and logic. Unable and unwilling to direct their own inner life, they were ready to surrender the control to a superior being, incommensurable with themselves. Reason neither gave nor promised happiness to mankind; but religion, and especially the Christian religion, gave man the assurance of happiness—beyond the grave. Thus the centre of gravity was shifted, and men's hopes and expectations were transferred to that future life. They were content to submit and suffer in this life, in order to find true

⁴104; see especially the fine summary, 115.

⁵For a man of such definite opinions as the author this is in itself remarkable. Except for the antidemocratic leaning which I discuss below, the only place where the personal feeling of the writer emerges is in a protest against the atrocities of Sulla (124).

⁶Nine full-page plates with nine pages of explanation illustrate the seven pages of text.

life hereafter. Such an attitude of mind was entirely foreign to the ancient world, even to the earlier nations of the East, not to speak of the Greeks and Romans. To a Greek the future life was something shadowy and formidable; life on earth alone was prized by him. But now all this was radically changed; and this change of feeling, more than anything else, proves that the beginning of the fourth century is the turning over of a new page, and a page of strange matter, in the history of humanity.

In the account of the decline after Constantine (Chapter XXIV) there is an equally sympathetic interpretation of early Christian literature and art.

The volume, which begins to grow thin during the account of the third century anarchy, comes practically to an end with the opening of the fourth century⁷. The last two chapters (351-359, 360-366) are short studies of the reasons for the decline of ancient civilization. Professor Rostovtzeff here departs from the usual method of the historian of Rome, which is to enumerate as many of the causes as possible, and then, after rejecting each of these in turn, to decide upon the 'fundamental' cause or causes. Professor Rostovtzeff puts all of his eggs in one basket: Rome fell, he says (366), because "the creative powers of the aristocracy" upon which the culture of the Greco-Roman world was founded "were finally undermined..." The reviewer, for one, has no faith in this explanation. He suspects that Professor Rostovtzeff's 'fundamental' cause has been evolved out of certain definite opinions on modern society and that his championship of ancient aristocracy is merely another way of expressing his criticism of contemporary democracy.

In my review of the first volume, I commented enthusiastically upon the Plates. Those in the volume under discussion are equally as distinctive and are, if anything, still more adequately selected. Professor Rostovtzeff has an unusually intimate knowledge of the museums, both public and private, in Europe and America, and has the faculty of bringing into his purview rare objects from little-known places. One of the unique features of the present volume is the inclusion of a chapter (266-285) consisting, in effect, entirely of Plates. The publishers no less than the author are to be congratulated upon the thoroughness with which the Plates have been reproduced. The photographs are without exception remarkably clear and beautifully lighted, and the reproduction on heavy paper is well-nigh perfect. With Professor Rostovtzeff's comments⁸ on the opposite pages they

⁷The abrupt ending is due apparently to the author's conviction that ancient culture came to an end with the reform of Constantine (333): "...the old Roman state of the Senate and people of Rome ceased to exist in the reign of Constantine, and gave place to a new system which was to rule both East and West for many centuries—a monarchy by the grace of God. The same time saw the death of another fundamental idea of Graeco-Roman civilization—the ideal of citizenship and freedom. In the monarchy that followed Constantine there was no longer any place for the citizens who had peopled the city-states of Greece and Italy: their room was taken by subjects". This arbitrary truncation is to my mind indefensible. The history of Rome is not equivalent to the history of "the Senate and the people of Rome", and the Romans lived on quite regardless of the fact that Constantine (or was it Augustus?) made subjects of them.

⁸These explanations might have been improved, however. They suffer occasionally from the author's scholarly restraint and become mere formal museum labels. The descriptions of coins especially (e.g. LXXIX, LXXXIII) are jejune, and no clue is

form a body of material which the teacher who stresses historical sources will welcome as a brilliant novelty. The teacher of Classics as well will find these ninety-six full-page Plates worth the price of the volume, even if he never glances at the text.

There are surprisingly few errors in these Plates. No explanation is given of the plan of the villa rustica near Gragnano (Text-figure 4, Plate XXIX), though the figures and the letters in the plan obviously call for one. Only the upper portion of the painting on Plate LXII.1 is explained on the opposite page. The lower portion receives no mention until it is referred to, in passing, on page 347. It would be a simple matter to add a cross-reference on page 272. That some differences of opinion may exist concerning the interpretation of the Plates is of course inevitable. I find it difficult, for instance, to accept Professor Rostovtzeff's explanation of Plate LXII. It seems to me that these representations of boys performing religious ceremonies are mere genre pictures. Certainly it seems a gratuitous assumption to declare that the house in which the frescoes were found belonged to an association of these boys. It may even be possible, although I suggest this without entire conviction, that the boys are used in the impersonal way in which the Erotes were so frequently employed in Hellenistic Roman art. I find it equally as difficult to believe that in the second portion of this Plate the boys actually are carrying a ship upon a cart. To my mind, the artist has taken particular pains (by drawing in the far side of the wagon, even to the ring or handle near the top) to indicate that the ship is *not* on the wagon, but is in the harbor beyond. The ceremony therefore is represented as taking place on the shore. The meeting of the Emperor and the barbarian chiefs as depicted on the Column of Trajan is far too enthusiastically described (234). What is merely the realism of a skilful artist is interpreted as evidence of prophetic insight:

"It is not only an artistically beautiful group but also a triumph of psychological intuition. Two worlds face each other—the proud world of the Romans, ... and ... the barbarians who were ready to take up the heritage of the Roman Empire.... The duel between the two worlds has just begun, and its deep significance was well understood by the artist of genius who created this scene..."

Again, on Plate XC.2 the seated figure on the right, according to Professor Rostovtzeff, "represents probably a cymbalist..." But the figure is clearly playing the double flute, as is seen from the position of the head, from the fact that the elbows rest on the knees, and, most conclusively, from the raised two fingers of the left hand.

In a work of such compass as this some errors either of judgment or of fact are bound to occur. On page 74, in the sentence, "...To the left is an arch erected over one of the Roman streets...", 'right' should be substituted for 'left'. On page 44, in the statement,

given to the student to the real significance of these objects as historical sources. So, too, it would have been useful to expand the description of portraits (such as those given in Plates XI, LXXX) with fuller comments on the personages represented and on such details as costume, hair-dressing, etc., as criteria of date.

"...In her <Tarentum's> struggle against...the Messapians of Apulia...", "Apulia" should be changed to 'Calabria'. In the chronological chart, which here (367-369), as in Volume I, is too limited to be of real service, the wars with the Teutons and the Cimbri are omitted.

It is not correct to say (30) that the growth of the plebeian movement was a "consequence" of the Gallic disaster. As Professor Rostovtzeff himself shows, this movement had assumed major proportions sixty years before the Gallic invasion.

It is equally inaccurate to say (56) that the strength of both Rome and Carthage was "based on a community of citizens and a citizen army, numerous and well trained..." Professor Rostovtzeff himself makes the correct statement on the very next page, when he points out that

the citizens of Carthage hardly ever served in the ranks, and their places were filled by mercenaries and allies who were liable to fail at the critical moment; whereas the Roman army contained no mercenaries and consisted entirely of citizens and allies....

There is a similar inconsistency where of the Jugurthine campaign the author says (116) "...itself the war did not cost many lives and was not specially important...", but later (117), "the destruction of thousands of Roman soldiers was due not only to the senatorial party but also to their opponents who insisted that the war, once begun, should be prosecuted with vigour..." The disgraceful *coup* by which the Romans acquired Sardinia and Corsica while the Carthaginians were distracted by their mercenaries is too significant a clue to Roman foreign policy to be dismissed with the words (61), "the two last <sic> were annexed by Rome after the conclusion of peace, and their loss was especially grievous..." So, too, the policy in Spain before the Second Punic War is delineated with too much restraint. Professor Rostovtzeff's statement here borders on humor⁹:

...An attempt was first made to arrest the expansion of Carthage by *peaceful* means. For this purpose Rome made use of her ancient connexion with the Graeco-Iberian community of Saguntum, which now became her ally. Saguntum might be useful in case of need, as a *military base* against Carthage. Rather earlier, in 226 B. C., Rome made an agreement with Hasdrubal, the Carthaginian general in Spain, by which the river Ebro was fixed as a limit between the spheres of influence of the two rivals.

There is surely some lapse of judgment on page 171, where Professor Rostovtzeff says, "...Among the poets we find such mighty geniuses as Catullus the lyric poet, Lucilius the satirist, and Lucretius the poet and philosopher..." The author here is carried away by his desire to prove the existence of a national literature. He had just written thus¹⁰:

"...In the first century Roman culture finally ceased to be a thing borrowed from foreigners, and became truly national. This is shown most clearly by the

literature. The Latin literature of this age is fresher and more direct than contemporary Greek literature..."

Professor Rostovtzeff's emphasis on this national revival is sound, but surely even the most enthusiastic protagonist of Roman tradition would hardly recognize in the fragments of Lucilius the traces of a "mighty genius"; Lucilius can in no sense be compared with Catullus and Lucretius or with Cicero, who is mentioned in the same way a little further on.

The well-known story of Cato and the figs from Carthage receives an interesting but, I think, erroneous interpretation. To Professor Rostovtzeff the moving force in Rome's antagonism to Carthage was economic, and therefore Rome's jealousy arose from the fact that the Carthaginians before the Third Punic War became an economic menace by reason of their interest in scientific agriculture. He tells the familiar story of Cato thus (81):

...The rising prosperity of Carthage was no secret to the Romans. The story told of Cato, chief of the nationalist and landowning party, is well known: returning from an embassy to Carthage, he rose in the Senate and held out a splendid bunch of figs, as a proof that the new birth of Carthage was dangerous to Rome, and that Carthage must be destroyed.

There is no doubt, however, that the point of the story in Plutarch is that political, not economic rivalry was at the basis of the Roman opposition; Cato's use of the fig was to prove that in the *proximity* of Carthage, not in its economic superiority, lay the menace¹⁰.

The author's enthusiasm for Tacitus ("the last great Roman writer": 225) is extreme (213):

...The genius of Tacitus is wonderful, and his penetration into the minds of the different rulers and those who stood round the throne is profound. If any one wishes to learn the characters of the immediate successors of Augustus, he may and must read what remains of these two works <the *Annales* and the *Historiae* of Tacitus>. All that has been written later about this period by ancient or modern historians is either a faint reflection of his genius or dry and lifeless extracts from his writings.

Professor Rostovtzeff's whole account of the Julian-Claudian dynasty is based upon Tacitus's account, and the student is nowhere warned of the difficulty, as well as the fascination, of that narrative¹¹.

Despite the fact, however, that it is not a perfect work and that it has the disadvantage of pretending not to be a textbook, this volume of Professor Rostovtzeff, with its predecessor, *The Orient and Greece*, offers the instructor in history the only extended, authoritative and attractive survey of the Ancient World which can with dignity be used with college students.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.

⁹The story is told in Plutarch, Cato 27.

¹⁰I would refer to my presentation, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 22.82-83, of the views of Mr. H. H. Asquith (later the Earl of Oxford and Asquith) concerning Tacitus. My sympathies are most decidedly with Professor Kraemer and Mr. Asquith. For a defense of Tacitus, in one matter, a very important matter, however, see a paper by Professor F. B. Marsh, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.135-138. C. K. >.

¹¹The italics are mine.

<¹²We may note that Lucilius does not belong to the first century; Catullus, Lucilius, and Lucretius were not contemporaries. C. K. >.

Scipio Africanus und die Begründung der Römischen Weltherrschaft. By Werner Schur. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (1927). Pp. VIII + 144.

The method adapted by Dr. Schur, who established his reputation by his excellent book, *Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1923)¹, is quite the opposite of that of Captain Hart². His aim (8) is to combine the researches of Meyer and Münzer into a whole, to extend them by his own studies, and thus to make them useful for the understanding of this great period of Roman history. He approaches the subject from two angles—the military and the political. However, his account of the military career of Scipio, while fairly complete, is rather sketchy as compared with that of Captain Hart; the lack of maps makes itself especially felt. Dr. Schur's forte lies in tracing Scipio's political career and the reasons that led to his downfall. Since Scipio's career forms a chapter in the history of Roman factional politics and of the feuds among the interrelated coteries of powerful senatorial groups, Dr. Schur, following the method of Münzer, gives us a well written, but not altogether convincing, account of the feuds that animated these various groups, whose unified front finally proved Scipio's undoing. The reading of the Appendix, *Die Parteiverhältnisse im Zeitalter Scipios* (104–141), in which Dr. Schur seeks to offer proof for statements made in his narrative, leaves the impression that family relationships were a much more important factor in Roman politics of this period than patriotism and regard for the interest of the State. Yet, as is well known, Roman nobles subordinated their private grievances and even sacrificed relationships in scores of instances when the interests of the State were at stake. In regard to these matters, then, the book requires revision.

Though Dr. Schur pays tribute to Scipio's greatness, he is not blind to Scipio's faults³. He does not condone Scipio's tearing up of his account books on the floor of the Senate House (93), nor does he try to explain it away, as Captain Hart does (239), by ascribing it to irritability resulting from illness. That Dr. Schur is keenly aware of the reasons that led to Scipio's downfall is clear from the passages quoted in the course of my review of Captain Hart's book (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 22, 127). We may quote him again (95, 104, 131):

...Für das grosse Individuum, das sich nur an sein eigenes inneres Gesetz gebunden fühlt, war in dieser römischen Republik noch kein Raum.

...Er musste fallen, weil seine persönliche Macht und Grösse die Interessen der allmächtigen Aristokratie verletzte....

...Er war ein Fremdkörper in dieser auf gleichförmige Begabung und Gleichheit der Ehrenrechte eingestellten Aristokratie.

¹A review of this book will shortly appear in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

²For a review of Captain H. H. Liddell Hart's book on Scipio, *A Greater Than Napoleon: Scipio Africanus*, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 22.127–128.

³On page 90 he rightly characterizes as brutal Scipio's conduct at the meeting of the Senate on March 15, 190 B. C.

If we compare Professor Schur's book, in general and in detail, with Captain Hart's book, we see that each has its good features and its weaknesses, but that they have much in common. Both authors admit that Mommsen's account is misguided, both see the significance of Scipio's Spanish campaign, which proved the key to final victory. Each book deserves serious consideration and study. A combination of the military account of Captain Hart and of the political account of Dr. Schur would give a far better book.

It is to be hoped that these two books will help to rescue Scipio from oblivion and will awaken new interest in him and his period.

HUNTER COLLEGE

JACOB HAMMER

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA¹

The 199th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on November 8, at the Princeton Club. Forty members and guests were present.

The paper of the evening, entitled *Western Alpine Passes Known to the Romans*, was read by Professor Walter Woodburn Hyde, of the University of Pennsylvania. In the entire chain of the Alps there were twenty-seven passes which the Romans knew and used. Of these only the passes in the Western Alps could be discussed in one paper. No one in the classical fraternity in America is better qualified to treat this subject than Professor Hyde, for he is a distinguished mountaineer, and has tramped over all these passes, examining in person both the historic and the prehistoric features and finds. Some of these passes were well known even in neolithic times. The history of each of the Western passes was carefully traced; all pertinent material, archaeological and literary, was considered. The paper was most enjoyable, especially for those who love the great mountains. One point brought out was that the beauty of these glorious mountains had no appeal for the Romans; they saw and felt only the hardships and terrors of the mountains².

The 202d regular meeting of the Club was held on Friday evening, February 1, with thirty-six members and guests present. The paper of the evening, entitled *Underground Rome*, was read by Professor E. H. Heffner, of the University of Pennsylvania. The paper, illustrated by lantern slides, presented the history of the Catacombs, and gave a description of them. The epigraphical material was discussed, as also the symbolism of the paintings, and the statement was made that the Christian doctrine of the early Church could be adequately formulated from this material. The Christian and pagan views of death were shown to be in sharp contrast.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*.

¹This account was sent in by Dr. Mitchell with his usual promptness. I mislaid it. C. K. >

²This point has, of course, often been made. The Greek attitude toward mountains was exactly that here ascribed to the Romans. One may read with profit in this connection Livy 21. 29.7, Livy's own statement about the impression made on Hannibal's forces by the sight of the Alps, and the speech which, in 21. 30, Livy puts into the mouth of Hannibal, a speech addressed by Hannibal to his soldiers.

Compare also my remarks in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 9.137, and my article, Professor W. W. Hyde on *The Mountains of Greece*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12. 97–99. C. K. >

THE DELPHIC MAXIMS IN LITERATURE

By ELIZA GREGORY WILKINS

"Know Thyself"

"Nothing too Much"

"Give a pledge, or give security, and trouble is at hand"

Brought together in this one book is all of consequence that has been written about these Delphic Maxims from their first appearance in literature until the present time.

Miss Wilkins's history of them down the ages touches literature of almost every type, as well as movements of thought which have characterized each period in the development of mankind.

\$3.00, postpaid \$3.15

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

A Successful Book, Improved by Experience

FIRST LATIN LESSONS, Revised

The first-year book of the three-year SCOTT LATIN PROGRAM

By
HARRY F. SCOTT

Ohio University

and

ANNABEL HORN

Girls' High School

Atlanta, Ga.

534 pages, \$1.20

Professor Scott's wide experience as a High-School teacher of Latin and as a writer of textbooks helped him make **First Latin Lessons** one of the most **teachable** of books. Now the original edition has been improved in the light of wide classroom use in Schools throughout the country.

Latin teachers will welcome these features of the new book which make it even more teachable than the earlier edition:

Equalized, carefully-graded vocabularies (no lesson with more than nine words).

Seventeen review lessons.

Careful presentation and distribution of new forms.

Clear presentation of syntax.

Connected translation exercises based on known vocabulary.

Write for complete information

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

CHICAGO

623 S. Wabash Ave.

ATLANTA

29 Pryor St., N. E.

DALLAS

1033 Young St.

NEW YORK

114 East 23rd St.



Puer in Tabella
Stilō Scribit

The School Review
says of the
PARSONS and LITTLE
First Latin Lessons

"It closely approximates the best tendencies in language-teaching. This book has proved satisfactory as a junior high school text and has also been used with success in the ninth grade. The book as a whole is sound, modern and interesting".

The New Heath Latin Series
Professor W. L. Carr, General Editor

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

New York Boston Chicago Atlanta
Dallas San Francisco London

Johnson's Latin Series



FIRST YEAR LATIN

FOSTER AND ARMS

SECOND YEAR LATIN

WALTER EUGENE FOSTER

These books present the first two years of High School Latin as a single unit and treat the subject from its functional aspect.

JOHNSON PUBLISHING COMPANY

NEW YORK: 55 Fifth Avenue

RICHMOND ATLANTA DALLAS
CHICAGO

PETRONIUS

"THE SATIRICON"

Edited by Evan T. Sage, Ph.D., of the University of Pittsburgh. It is the first edition of Petronius to be prepared for classroom use which includes the full text of *The Satiricon* with those parts annotated that are characteristic and interesting. There are an introduction and notes.

Price, \$2.35

**THE
CENTURY
COLLEGE
LATIN
SERIES**

LIVY

XXX - XXXIII

Edited by Clarence W. Mendell, Ph.D., of Yale University. Its chief advantage is that it makes available a new body of Livy material which covers a vitally important period in the history of Rome. There are an introduction, notes, and an index of the names of persons referred to in the text.

Price, \$2.25

**THE
CENTURY
CO.**

**ENGLISH
AND
LATIN**

By Marbury B. Ogle, Ph.D., of the Ohio State University. A manual of prose composition which brings into high relief the differences between English and Latin and reveals the usefulness of Latin. Explains important grammatical principles with examples and an abundance of exercises.

Price, \$1.35

**353 Fourth Avenue
New York**

**2126 Prairie Avenue
Chicago**